

"Mickey was as gallant in action as he had been in the ring as a cadet."

For my next expedition, to the Negev, my guide was Col. Israel Carmi, the beefy commando-fighter whose Palmach night raiders roamed the desert with Mickey and a score of jeeps immediately after the tank-led Egyptian invasion, taking the steam out of the enemy advance. We sped under a blazing sun to Negba, Dorot, and other valiant little communities, where scarred water-towers and wrecked Egyptian tanks still bore witness to the trials of 1948.

As Carmi showed me traces of the trenches from which Palmach youngsters, following Mickey's example, fought off diving Spitfires with their rifles, he summed up tersely: "The impact of Mickey's presence was tremendous. We didn't need Napoleon in the Negev; we needed Mickey Marcus."

To finish up the sector surveys, I retraced the route to the Galilee taken 14 years ago by Mickey and Yigael Alon, then chief of the Palmach: across the Jezreel plain; down to the Sea of Galilee and Tiberias, where sniper fire dented Alon's armored car; up the coiling mountain road to the former Palmach HQ on cloud-high Mt. Canaan. At Rosh Pinne, I examined the spot where the two Haganah commanders had bluffed their way with a cargo of illegal arms past a British road block.

In a book-crammed, high-walled study near the Government offices in Jerusalem, Yigael Yadin talked of Mickey's grasp of Israel's military problems: "He provided a balanced view that was invaluable." Shlomo Shamir, the Haganah commander who first "recruited" Mickey in the United States, offered a fascinating glimpse of the complex motives that guided this hitherto non-Zionist Jew to the embattled Jewish State: a compound of West Point, Dachau, Talmudic ethics, and the United Nations. The army archives yielded not only original drafts of Mickey's training manuals, but the texts of numerous military directives and top-secret operational messages from the period when he took command of all three brigades in the Jerusalem area on May 28.

I now caught up with Col. Amos Chorev, the Palmach scout who first convinced Mickey that a backroad could be carved across the mountains to Jerusalem. Chorev volunteered to retrace his original jeep route. At long last, I would be able to explore the "Burma Road."

A withering khamseen, the oven-hot desert wind from the east, had just come up. With a driver-specialist and a couple of rifles (our path would take us within a few hundred yards of Israel's eastern frontier), we piled into a jeep near the deserted Arab village of Beit Jiz, east of Huldah. A weed-covered, bumpy mountain trail—the first stretch of the "Burma Road"—took us to Beit Sussin. Here, at a fig patch near an ancient watering-place, the donkey trail stopped.

But Chorev did not. Pointing the nose of the jeep up the steep, jagged incline to the north, he stepped on the gas. Up we shot, crashing through scrub trees, hurdling gullies and climbing slabs of slippery limestone—till we jolted to a halt on the edge of the plateau. A rear wheel had snagged on a boulder.

We heaved the jeep loose. Chorev got out and guided us foot by foot, while the driver wrestled with the wheel and I hung on to anything in sight. The descents were worse, with the jeep threatening to overturn and send us plunging to the bottom of 400-foot cliffs.

By the time we stumbled out of the 110° heat into a cafe on the Hartuv Highway, I knew all that was necessary about the terrain of the "Burma Road." In broad daylight, the trip was a nightmare. What it must have been under the original conditions of blackness punctuated by Arab Legion artillery fire, is beyond conjecture.

The road that saved Jerusalem was completed by Mickey's forces on the night of June 7, 1948. Three days later, the Supreme Commander of the Central Front met his death near the Arab village of Abu Ghosh, on the grounds of a lovely monastery—Notre Dame de la Nouvelle Alliance. The clergy had been evacuated because of Arab shellfire and the monastery served as a rear headquarters for the Palmach.

Late one summer afternoon, with fellow-writer Meyer Levin and his novelist wife, Tereska Torres, I drove up the winding path to the garden of sycamores and tamarisks where the monastery stands, perched on a hilltop of biblical serenity. Purple shadows were creeping up from the surrounding valleys, over crumbled terraces that were once the hanging wonderlands of the Old Testament. Faintly visible in the darkening east were the fairytale towers of Jerusalem, old and mystical and wordlessly beckoning.

We were greeted by an angular, black-cassocked Benedictine monk of enormously Gallic mien. Softly, with marked respect, he pointed out the straggling stone fence, where in an almost incredible confluence of ironic circumstances, like Stonewall Jackson of American Civil War fame, Mickey Marcus was accidentally shot down by one of his own sentries.

The Catholic convent, Père Joseph told us, pointing out faint but magnificent old floor mosaics, was built over the site of a pre-Christian synagog. But the location went back even further in Jewish history. Here stood the "house of Abinadab in the hill," where, according to the Book of Samuel, the Holy Ark of the Covenant was kept for 20 years after its recapture from the Philistines. Then it was brought back to Jerusalem by King David.

David "Mickey" Marcus had fallen within a hundred feet of the spot where, 2,000 years before, the immortal warrior-king for whom he was named had danced and sung in praise of the Lord.

Seven Ways To Combat Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1962

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues this morning's article by Drew Pearson concerning ways to fight communism. This distinguished columnist has had a broad experience fighting communism: he was the first newsman to write the Soviet-Canadian spy-ring story, he uncovered the theft of B-29 blueprints, he helped organize the Friendship Train, and the democracy letters that helped turn the tide of the first Italian elections.

His precepts should interest all of us. They make sense and contain a lot of commonsense.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD Mr. Pearson's article, which reads as follows:

PRINCIPLES AGAINST COMMUNISM

(By Drew Pearson)

ABOARD THE SS "DELTA QUEEN"—Being out here on the broad Mississippi River with no telephones, no telegrams, and no distractions

is conducive to thinking about the might and majesty of what man has wrought.

This has set me to thinking about the favorite topic of discussion on the part of a great many would-be pilots of the Nation recently—our failures to combat communism. They have seen Communists behind every bedpost, have predicted the United States was on the way to becoming an arm of the Kremlin, and some have charged that because I listened to and reported the views of Nikita Khrushchev for 2 days last summer, I am pro-Communist.

It so happens that I know something about combating communism, having been the first newsman to report the Soviet-Canadian spy ring, having uncovered the theft of the B-29 blueprints, helped put across the Friendship Train and the democracy letters to Italy that turned the tide of the first Italian elections, and having organized the Freedom Balloons into Poland and Czechoslovakia at a time when the Iron Curtain was so rigid not even a Fuller brush salesman could get through.

And having listened carefully to those who would combat communism by preaching hate and suspicion of their fellow Americans, I would like to outline my own seven points for preventing communism. I'll be brief. Here they are:

1. The elimination of property: When I get letters from mothers who are struggling to feed their children and whose husbands don't have jobs, I know they and the children they are bringing up could be converts to communism.

2. Honesty: Corruption in high places, and low places, too, is another way of inducing communism. A democratic-republican form of government must be an honest government. Likewise, our capitalistic system of business must be honest. Once either loses high ethical standards, then is the time to begin worrying about communism.

3. Respect of government: This goes hand in hand with honesty. If we don't respect our Government officials we have the right, by means of the ballot, to change them. But if we lose respect for too many of them we may want to change our system. That's why it's so important to keep government fair and honest, so as to keep respect for and confidence in government.

4. Respect for religion: Some of those who are beating the tom-toms loudest about the dangers of communism are the Bible-pounding fundamentalist preachers of the extreme right, and one of their stocks in trade is to smear their fellow preachers as Communists. The Reverend Billy James Hargis claims that the National Council of Churches "aids and abets communism." He also managed to sell the Air Force on inserting similar charges in its troop indoctrination program.

But the more you undermine churches and the more you destroy the influence of religion the more you aid communism. The first step taken by most Communist governments has been to shut down the churches and curb the clergy. Yet the Bible-pounding fundamentalists, who make such a display of teaching anticommunism, are probably the greatest single voices undermining the churches.

5. Equality of opportunity and fair competition: Monopoly is one step that makes it easy for a Communist takeover. Communism thrives on monopoly; in fact, is monopoly. Under communism the government owns and runs everything. There is no private business or small business.

Therefore, when you stamp out little business, or little labor, you take a step which could eventually make it easier for communism. This applies to big labor just as much as it does to big business.

6. Respect for the dignity of man: The individual isn't important under the Communist system. He is subordinated to the state. But under the Judaic-Christian

philosophy, the dignity of man is all-important—and that is true, regardless of his color, his wealth, or his religion.

7. Strength: By this I don't mean merely military and physical strength, though in this day and age they are important. I also mean educational strength, cultural strength, scientific strength, and moral and spiritual strength.

We have neglected our schools at a time when the Communist world has spent money "hand over fist" strengthening its entire educational system. We once ranked first in science. But of late we have turned out more insurance salesmen, stockbrokers, and "jazz" experts than scientists, so that Russia has forged ahead of us in the science of space.

The average schoolteacher, in both our farm areas and big cities, can do more to combat communism in a quiet, unsensational, non-name-calling way than almost any other person in America. But we don't give him or her either the tools or a living wage to do it.

These are my seven principles for combating communism.

All-Channel Television Receivers

SPEECH
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 1, 1962

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8031) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to give the Federal Communications Commission certain regulatory authority over television receiving apparatus.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, it is quite apparent that none of us wants to see the approximately 70 UHF stations going to waste through lack of use. It is also apparent that many are concerned that the end does not justify the means when an improper means is used to attain the end. This problem is something like the chicken and the egg situation, whether you start with the UHF station or UHF-VHF receiving sets. Obviously both are needed. Again all of us share a concern over the deintermixture whereby UHF or VHF would be denied metropolitan areas as they are segregated one from the other in different areas.

My opposition to this bill is very fundamental. This is the wrong means to attain the end. Constitutionally, I do not believe this Congress has the right to lay down manufacturing specifications. Since we take an oath to support the Constitution, this argument alone is enough reason for me to oppose this bill. But even as the Constitution is soundly based on fundamental principles there are also other objections which I have that are quite fundamental:

First. Consumers would be forced to pay more for their television sets.

Second. After having paid more because the Federal Government forced manufacturers to include the additional UHF channels they would not be able to benefit from UHF reception if no stations were available in their area. Further, I have been reliably informed that UHF adapters can be added to present TV sets

at such time as TV set owners choose to do so. Here there is an element of free choice, which I think is a basic fundamental of free society so typical of our constitutional Republic within a democracy. Unfortunately as the deintermixture action by the FCC, more unfortunate, it seems to me is this deal between the FCC and Members of Congress to force the manufacturers and the consumers to conform to Federal regulation.

In addition, it is my understanding that we are not even sure that the UHF broadcasting will work. The \$2 million engineering investigation in New York City of technical problems relating to UHF signal characteristics prescribed by the Federal Communications Commission has not resulted in findings necessary to know if such UHF broadcasting will be successful. In passing this bill we therefore have the cart before the horse, it seems to me.

Finally, as a precedent, wherein the Federal Government controls the manufacturer there is no telling how far such control may extend in the future. For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, therefore, I must oppose the bill.

What Is Wilderness?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 1962

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, part 1 of the "Summary of Major Findings and Recommendations" of the special report to the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission entitled "Wilderness and Recreation: A Report on Resources, Values, and Problems" deals with the question "What is wilderness?" It deals with this question to the extent considered necessary in order to make clear what was considered in the studies on which the report was based, and what the basis is for the recommendations presented in the report.

The Wildland Research Center of the University of California, by whom the study was made, under the direction of James P. Gilligan, wilderness project director, decided to consider only areas of 100,000 acres or more—for which the term "wilderness tract" was adopted.

Within the 48 States other than Alaska and Hawaii, Dr. Gilligan and his associates considered 64 such wilderness tracts of "public or Indian land available for overnight recreation use within the contiguous United States first, at least 100,000 acres in extent; second, containing no roads usable by the public; third, within a reasonably unified boundary configuration; and, fourth, showing no significant ecological disturbance from onsite human activity—except that domestic livestock grazing is an accepted disturbance in the West and early-day logging is accepted for eastern tracts."

The report explains in a footnote that "on-site activities are those per-

formed within the wilderness tract, as distinct from activity outside the tract which may have indirect effects on the wilderness."

These wilderness tracts thus described are not necessarily within any one land-administration area. Nor are they necessarily confined to areas designated for preservation. An example is one tract that includes a national-forest wild area and also an adjacent area of State forest land plus two divisions of national forest land not classified. The wilderness tracts are areas of wilderness actually on the land as described.

In other words this wilderness report does not set forth a proposal for a new wilderness definition but simply defines the areas considered in the study on which it is based.

The report itself says, and I quote:

It should be strongly emphasized that this definition is not a recommendation. It constitutes a premise on which analysis has proceeded, not a conclusion of what wilderness should be.

The term "wilderness tract" is peculiar to this study—useful there but not applied to the classification of lands elsewhere. The Outdoor Recreation Commission, for example, did not use the term in its classification proposals. The Commission uses the term "primitive" to refer to areas that are primeval and the term "wilderness area" to designate those "primitive" lands that have been set aside for preservation. The Wilderness Act has definitions and applications that are consistent with these.

For the purposes of a national wilderness policy and a practical program for administering Federal lands in carrying out this policy, the Wilderness Act includes an excellent definition.

When we of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission on one occasion faced the question of what wilderness is and adjourned without coming to a decision at that time, I remember that Ervin L. Peterson, then Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, following our meeting wrote a comment strongly commending the definition then in the wilderness bill—the same now included in the Wilderness Act—and Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, also a member of the Commission, and I heartily agreed.

This definition states the nature of wilderness first philosophically and then descriptively and, while avoiding arbitrary acreage limitations, makes plain the areas to be so considered for a national wilderness system. It says, in section 2(b):

A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which (1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's works substantially unnoticeable; (2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation;